

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,774	04/06/2001	Thomas R. Gehring	56522USA.002	7350
32692	7590 06/15/2004		EXAMINER	
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427			MAHONEY, CHRISTOPHER E	
	MN 55133-3427		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2851	
			DATE MAILED: 06/15/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		AV8			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Antique Comments	09/827,774	GEHRING ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Christopher E Mahoney	2851			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the	36(a). In no event, however, may a sy within the statutory minimum of thir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON, cause the application to become Af	reply be timely filed  by (30) days will be considered timely.  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 M	larch 2003.				
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal mat	ers, prosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	). 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			•		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6,9-23 and 33-40 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 7,8,24,26-30 and 32 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 25 and 31 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	·			
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	s have been received. s have been received in A rity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)			
<ul> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.</li> </ul>	Paper No(	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/827,774

Art Unit: 2851

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Preliminary Matters**

The examiner notes that the response filed March 25, 2003 indicates it is a response to an Office Action mailed September 27, 2003. This is clearly a minor typographical error. The Office Action was mailed November 20, 2002. The remainder of the applicant's March 25, 2003 response is clearly a response to the November 20, 2002 Office Action and is treated as such.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 24, 28-29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,558). Tanaka teaches a projector (P), a projection screen having a first (2r) and second (2f) surfaces, the screen adapted to receive an image from the projector and present it to a viewer (A), the screen having a light absorbing means (5) for absorbing ambient light, and an adhesive (col. 2, line 13) associated with the screen for optically coupling the screen to a substantially transparent window (col. 2, lines 6-7, col. 3, line 15) in a position capable of being viewed (show window). The screen is flexible (col. 2, line 11) and therefore conformable (fig. 8, col. 6, lines 1-2).

Application/Control Number: 09/827,774

Art Unit: 2851

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,558). Tanaka teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for the adhesive being permanent. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a permanent adhesive for the purpose of economic efficiency. It would not be economical to have to keep replacing the screen of Tanaka every day if the adhesive did not last. Alternatively it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the permanence. One would not use a temporary adhesive for a permanent installation.

Claims 7-8 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,558) in view of Burger (U.S. Patent No. 4,095,013) or Neu (*Lecturing with a Notebook Computer*). Tanaka teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for the adhesive being removable. Both Burger (figure – cling adhesive) and Neu (page 120, col. 2, lines 7-8, "plastic sheets that adhere by static cling") teach that it was known to utilize a removable adhesive. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the features taught by Burger or Neu for the purpose of portability.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,558) in view of Depalma (U.S. Patent No. 3,754,813). Tanaka teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for a cutting means to cut the screen to customize

Art Unit: 2851

shape. Depalma teaches a cutting tool (figure 7) for cutting a screen to a customized shape. The applicant is directed to review figure 7 as well as col. 9, line 63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the features taught by Depalma for the purpose of customizing the view.

# Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-6,9-23 and 33-40 are allowed.

Claims 25 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7,8,24,26-30 and 32 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher E Mahoney whose telephone number is (571) 272-2122. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5PM, Monday-Thursday.

Application/Control Number: 09/827,774

Art Unit: 2851

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lefkowitz can be reached on (571)272-2180. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher E Mahoney Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2851